



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO		
10/738,443 12/16/2003		Howard A. Fields	14114.0342U3	8740		
52488	7590	04/18/2006		EXAMINER		
		SEASE CONTROL	HORNING, MICHELLE S			
999 PEACH			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
SUITE 1000	0		1648			
ATLANTA	, GA 30	309	DATE MAILED: 04/18/2006			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary			10/738,443	FIELDS ET AL.					
			Examiner	Art Unit					
			Michelle Horning	1648					
Period fo	 The MAILING DATE of this community 	ication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence ad	ddress				
WHI(- Exte after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MINIORS of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this common period for reply is specified above, the maximum state to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months are dipatent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	AILING DA of 37 CFR 1.13 nunication. atutory period wi will, by statute,	TE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro cause the application to become ABANDON	ON. timely filed m the mailing date of this of IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1)	Responsive to communication(s) file	d on							
·	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.								
3)□	,—								
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposit	ion of Claims								
4)⊠	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>44-53</u> is/are pending in the application.								
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-43</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
	Claim(s) is/are rejected.								
	☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8)🖂	8) Claim(s) 44-53 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Applicat	ion Papers								
9)	The specification is objected to by the	e Examiner							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.									
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).									
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim	for foreign ;	oriority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
	a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:								
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.								
·	3. Copies of the certified copies	of the priori	ty documents have been recei	ved in this National	Stage				
	application from the Internation	nal Bureau	(PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* \$	See the attached detailed Office action	n for a list o	of the certified copies not receive	ved.					
Attachmen	t(s)								
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summar						
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or		Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal		O-152)				
	r No(s)/Mail Date		6) Other:	.,	•				

DETAILED ACTION

Restriction/Election

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 44-47, drawn to methods for the detection of antibodies against
 Hepatitis A virus, classified in class 435, subclass 5.
- Claims 48-53, drawn to methods of making a synthetic peptide to enhance immunoreactivity or immunuogeniticty, classified in class 530, subclass 333.

Inventions I and II are related. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, inventions I and II are distinct because they are methods with different modes of operation, with respect to starting materials, physiological mechanisms, protocol procedures, and end products.

Species Election

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: SEQ ID 1-88. The species are independent or distinct because the inventions SEQ ID 1-88 are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not

Application/Control Number: 10/738,443

Art Unit: 1648

disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, SEQ ID 1-88 represent structurally different polypeptides and the polynucleotides encoding them. Therefore, where structural identity is required, such as for binding or expression, the different sequences have differential effects.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1, 48 and 51 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.

MPEP § 809.02(a).

Conclusion

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Application/Control Number: 10/738,443

Art Unit: 1648

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michelle Horning whose telephone number is 571-272-9036. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jim Housel can be reached on 571-272-0902. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/738,443 Page 5

Art Unit: 1648

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michelle Horning, Patent Examiner

> SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600